

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action dated October 16, 2008, claims 1, 4-9, 16-18, 25-29 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Loisey et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,999,912 in view of Liu et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,898,780. Claims 12, 13, 21, 22, 30 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Loisey et al. in view of Liu et al. and further in view Goyal et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,976,258.

Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Certified Copy of the Priority Document***

Applicant is in the process of obtaining a certified copy of the priority document, and expects to file the certified copy with the USPTO in the immediate future.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

All of the claims stand rejected based on Loisey in combination with other references. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 1, which recites:

- (iv) keeping the wrapper active only until the requested server is identified, and the communication is handed to the requested server, and then **terminating the wrapper**;

The Office Action argues that the service provider communicates with the user's computer, and cites steps 530-590 in FIG. 4, and column 14, line 65 – column 16, line 19 in

Loisey. However, the (fairly lengthy) cited passage in Loisey says nothing about **terminating** the wrapper. As best can be understood from Loisey's description, Loisey's wrapper is an ActiveX wrapper, which is also used as a permanent wrapper to provide access from a client to the server. Nothing in Loisey says anything about terminating the wrapper, for example, after authorization. If the Examiner continues to maintain this rejection, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner explain with greater specificity which particular passage in Loisey discloses termination of the wrapper, and how the Examiner interprets that passage.

***Claim 7***

Regarding claim 7, which recites that each domain has its own instance of the virtual server, the Office Action cites column 3, lines 49-55 and column 14, lines 20-35 in Loisey as allegedly disclosing this aspect. Applicants respectfully disagree. These passages are reproduced below:

According to the present invention, a virtual operating system, software applications, data and electronic mail and messaging services are stored, maintained and operated at a remote terminal server and are provided to the user over the Internet or over the intranet of an organization such as a company or educational institution.

...

It should be understood by those skilled in the art that the networked computing environment **100** may be operated by a given application service provider or Internet service provider or other computer services provider **165**. Accordingly, management of the networked computing environment **100** is performed by system administrators of such organizations through management of the directory services system **135** of the domain controller **130**. Alternatively, a number of computer services providers **165** may be resident in a single networked computing environment controlled by a larger computer services provider **165**. That is, a number of computer services providers may be nested within the networked computing environment **100** to provide services to their users **105** through a larger computer services provider that manages the services, functionality and security of the system through the domain controller **130**.

A review of the cited passages does not support the logic of the rejection, since nothing in these passages suggests that virtual servers are associated with each domain. (The passage discusses virtual operating systems, which is not the same thing.) In the event that the Examiner continues to maintain the rejection, Applicants respectfully request a clarification of how the Examiner is interpreting the cited passage in Loisey.

***Claim 12***

Regarding claim 12, the Office Action cites column 8, line 36 – column 9, line 37 and column 1, lines 9-12 of Goyal as allegedly disclosing the claimed feature of providing a replacement shared library that includes **additional functionality**. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants have reviewed the cited passages in Goyal, but can find nothing in the cited passage that refers to any **additional** functionality (there is functionality described, obviously, but not additional functionality). In the event that the Examiner continues to maintain this rejection, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner clarify how he interprets this passage, and which additional functionality is disclosed in the cited passages in Goyal.

***Claim 13***

Regarding claim 13, which is rejected based on column 8, lines 19-35 of Goyal, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants do not dispute that Goyal discloses dynamic links. However, a hook and a dynamic link, are not the same thing. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BARDMESSER LAW GROUP

/GB/

George S. Bardmesser  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,020

Date: December 5, 2008

1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 293-1191